



THE
LITERARY MAGAZINE.
AUGUST 1735.

ARTICLE XLIII.

The History of the Troubles of GREAT BRITAIN: Containing a particular Account of the most remarkable Passages in Scotland, from the Year 1633 to 1650. With an exact Relation of the Wars carried on, and Battles fought by the Marquis of Montrose (all which are omitted in the Earl of Clarendon's History.) Also a full Account of the Transactions in England during that Time. Written in French by Robert Monteth, of Salmonet. To which is added, the true Causes and favourable Conjectures which contributed to the Restoration of King Charles II. Translated by Capt. James Ogilvie. London; printed for G. Strahan, at the Golden Ball over-against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill; R. Williamson, near Gray's-Inn Gate in Holborn; C. Rivington, in St. Paul's Church-yard; and J. Leake, at the Bath. MDCCXXXV. Folio. Containing 557 Pages, beside Preface and Index.



THE earl of Clarendon's history has long been in every one's hands; and we have been used to consider it as a complete account of the troubles in Great Britain, from the great rebellion to the restoration of Charles the second. The publick, however, is now presented with several curious particulars relating to the affairs of

Scotland, omitted by that noble writer. It were to be wish'd, that every historian could, with justice, make the same profession as the French author before us doth. "I have written, says he, "without passion and without "partiality: for tho' I take the "part in those affairs which my "religion, my honour, and my "birth oblige me to take in "them; yet I observe an exact
Z z " neu-

" neutrality. I have not the least
 " design of pleasing or displeasing
 " any person; and I am so far
 " from being the minister of
 " other men's passions, that, for
 " my part, had I any of my
 " own, I would look upon it as
 " base to let them appear in this
 " history.

Mr. *Monteth* divides his history into twelve books. He begins with the coronation of *Charles* the first in *Scotland*, which was solemnized on the 21st of *June* 1633. On which occasion it is observed, that *Edgar* was the first king of *Scotland* who was crown'd; and that that ceremony was perform'd, in 1101, by *Godrick*, bishop of *St. Andrew's*, then suffragan to the archbishop of *York*.

The week after the coronation the king met his parliament; in which the chief affairs that came under consideration were the regulation of the tythes; and the revocation, which the king had made of the church-lands, dismember'd from the crown, which had been annex'd to it at the change of religion in *Scotland*. The decision that was made displeased many of the members; but our author undertakes to shew, that they complained without reason. Lord *Balmarino*, a man of great judgment, very cunning and active, but deeply engaged in the puritan faction, was at the head of the malecontents on this occasion. The year after the king had returned to *London* (1634) that nobleman caused a writing, in the form of a remonstrance to the king, to be dispersed, containing complaints of many things

passed in the last parliament by force, and contrary to the laws and method of parliament; but striking indirectly at the king's authority. For this he was condemn'd to die; but pardon'd by his majesty.

The confidence which the king reposed in the bishops, and the care he took to heighten their authority, gave great offence to the puritans: but his orders for composing a *Liturgy* for the use of the church of *Scotland*, after the model of that used in *England*, afforded them a more specious pretence for rising up in arms. Here our historian gives us a short detail of the attempts made by king *James* for establishing church-discipline in *Scotland*; which is follow'd by the disputes in that kingdom concerning the *Liturgy* offer'd for publick use, which employ'd the years 1635 and 1636. His majesty's proclamation for its reception was publish'd at *Edinburgh*, *December* the 20th, of the year last mention'd. The reading of it was delay'd to the month of *July* following. This was begun at *Edinburgh* on *Sunday* the 23d; but opposed in a tumultuous manner. Soon after, as some persons of quality, in concert with several ministers, had presented a petition to the council, desiring that the use of the *Liturgy* might be suspended till the king should be more fully informed of the matter; the council order'd, that the bishops should not press the reading of it till his majesty had received the petition, and declared his mind more fully in that point.

This

This was sent to *England* in 1637; but the king declared his resolution of supporting the *Liturgie*, and removed the court of sessions to *Linlithgow* for six months, and afterwards to *Dundee*, where it was to continue during his majesty's pleasure. But the petitioners presented a paper of complaints against the bishops, charging them with abusing the king's authority, in order to surprize his subjects, by imposing on them, contrary to the laws, an idolatrous form of service, and a book of *Canons*, which gave the bishops an absolute power to change the religion at pleasure. All the answer the king thought fit to give, was, that he had an aversion to all abuse and superstition in religion, and had no intention to do any prejudice to the laws and liberties of the kingdom. This was done by a proclamation, publish'd at *Linlithgow* on the 27th of *December*.

The petitioners, not receiving the desired satisfaction, protested against a proclamation, publish'd at *Stirling* in *February* 1638; and then went to *Edinburgh*; where, being joined by great numbers, a resolution was form'd of entering into what they called a *Covenant*. His majesty condemn'd this act as rash, unlawful, and tending to open rebellion. The *Covenant*, however, was subscribed, in the month of *February*, by all present in the city of *Edinburgh*; and copies of it were dispersed through the whole kingdom; where it was so well received, that, before the end of *April*, a man was scarce reckon'd a protestant who had not

subscribed it. The king then sent the duke of *Hamilton* into *Scotland*, in character of his *High Commissioner*, to endeavour to compose the quarrel amicably. But the negotiation broke off without coming to any conclusion. Before the duke set out for *England*, he publish'd a royal proclamation; whereby the king declared, "That he would maintain the protestant religion; and that he would no more press the *Liturgie*, or the books of *Canons* and *Ordination*, but by lawful means: That he would reform the court of high commission, and speedily give orders for an assembly, and the meeting of a parliament." But this was not sufficient; the *Covenanters* insisted on the abolition of the *Liturgie* and high commission; and protested, "They would never break up their meetings till the purity of religion and the peace of the kingdom should be well establish'd by a national and free assembly."

The duke, at his return to *England*, presented the king with a petition from the *Covenanters*; and received fresh instructions from his majesty, with which he hasten'd to *Scotland*. These were drawn up in eleven articles, to be proposed to the *Covenanters*, relating to the power and actions of the presbyteries; and requiring that all meetings should be broke up; that every one should retire to his own house; and that no body should be press'd to sign the *Covenant*. No satisfactory answer being made to these proposals, the duke desired they would not

undertake any thing till he should return to his majesty, and consult him about means for satisfying their demand of an assembly. This was granted, tho' with great difficulty, and on condition that he should come back to *Scotland* before the 22d of *September*; on failure of which, it should be lawful for them to take care of their own affairs. In the mean time, the *Covenanters* publish'd a treatise, to shew, that the church had such a power in some cases, and that the church of *Scotland* was then obliged to employ it. The duke, at his return to *Edinburgh*, issued out a proclamation, in the king's name, in favour of the *Covenanters*; by which he annulled all the acts of council made for imposing the *Liturgy* and book of *Canons*; subjected the bishops to the censure of the assembly; suspended the court of high-commission; and promised to call a general assembly at *Glasgow* on the 21st of *Nov.* and a parliament at *Edinburgh* on the 15th of *May* following. The lords of the council wrote a letter of thanks to the king; and the moderate *Covenanters* express'd their satisfaction with the proclamation; but the rigid part of them drew up a long protest against it, a copy of which they deliver'd to the king's herald. According to the purport of it, here given by our author, those zealous gentlemen distrusted the king's intentions; they would hear of nothing but what formally condemned an episcopal government in the church; and appealed from the council to the assembly and parliament, as the only su-

preme tribunals of the kingdom; which had been forbidden, under pain of high treason, in the eighth session of parliament under king *James*, in the year 1548.

The assembly was open'd at the time and place appointed. The duke's commission being read, Dr. *Robert Hamilton* presented his grace with an exception from the bishops against the assembly. A moderator being chosen, the duke required, that the said exception should be read; to which it was replied, that the assembly could deliberate on nothing till it should appear that it was composed of all its lawful members; for which end the commissions of all the commissioners were first to be seen. On the 27th of *November*, the exception of the bishops was read; as also another, drawn up by several ministers. In the former, the prelates profess'd themselves ready to submit to a general assembly, lawfully convened; and affirm'd, that the calling of it belong'd to the king. They protested against the assembly now met at *Glasgow*, for several reasons here set down by our author; the chief of which were, That the presbyteries had elected their commissioners to the assembly, and appointed a solemn fast, on that occasion, on the 16th of *September*; whereas his majesty's warrant for calling it was not publish'd till the 22d of that month: That, tho' the presbyteries had been invested with such authority, they had forfeited it by deposing the moderators named by the bishops in their diocesan synods, contrary to the act of the assembly of

of *Glasgow* in 1610, and the act of parliament in 1612: That the greatest part of the ministers of this assembly had not complied with the acts of parliament passed in 1572 and 1612; which order the ministers, under pain of degradation, to sign the confession of faith within the first month after their ordination, and to take the oath of supremacy. These, and several other disqualifying articles, were exhibited by the bishops. The ministers complained, that the layicks, not having in former times meddled with doctrine, but only assisted the clergy in discipline, they now took upon them to judge in the presbyteries and assemblies of the spirits of the prophets, which were subject only to the prophets.

After some debates, the duke, being convinced of the nullity of the assembly, declared it dissolved on the 28th of *November*. After the duke was gone out, the moderator desired the opinion of the assembly on two questions: *First*, Whether the assembly ought to be continued? *Secondly*, Whether the assembly, as it now stood, was a competent judge of the bishops? Both which being answer'd in the affirmative, a formal sentence of degradation was passed against all the bishops; some of them were declared infamous, and incapable of exercising any ministerial function, and excommunicated with the greater excommunication. The bishops of *Dunkel* and *Caithness* were only suspended; and, on repentance and submission to the assembly, were to continue in their mini-

stry. They then proceeded to the abolition of episcopacy. The other decisions of the assembly were but consequences and appendixes to this; which, however, our exact historian gives us at length. At last, having made an act for yearly general assemblies, and appointed the next to be held at *Edinburgh*, in *July* 1639; they resolved that a petition should be sent to the king, begging his approbation of the sense they had given to the confession of faith; the substance of which appears in the book before us. It is dated *January* the 12th, 1639; and was follow'd by a declaration, on the 4th of *February*, address'd to all the good christians of *England*, in order to justify their intentions and conduct. This was suppress'd by the king's authority, who issued out a proclamation on the 27th of *February*, which he order'd to be read in all the churches of *England*.

The first book concludes with the king's declaring the *Covenanters* rebels, and preparing to bring them to reason by force of arms. In the second, we shall see how he succeeded.

The king borrow'd large sums of the chief nobility, the gentlemen of the long robe, and the *English* clergy, without regarding the parliament; and thus a good army was soon raised. The earl of *Arundel* was made lieutenant-general, and *York* appointed to be the place of rendezvous. At the same time, a fleet, manned with four or five thousand men, was put under the command of the duke of *Hamilton*. The *Covenanters*,

nanters, on their side, prepared for a vigorous defence, and made themselves masters of the principal fortresses of the kingdom. The marquis of *Huntley* took up arms for the king in the north country, where the marquis of *Montrose* got the start of him; and the heads of the *Covenanters* having invited him to a conference at *Aberdeen*, with assurance, under their hands, that he should be at liberty to return, he was carried prisoner, with his eldest son, to the castle of *Edinburgh*.

In the mean time, the duke of *Hamilton*, with the fleet, cast anchor in the road of *Leith*; from whence he sent to the governor of *Edinburgh*, ordering him to receive the king's commands, and cause his majesty's proclamation against the *Covenanters* to be published. The governor desired he might not be pressed for an answer, till the parliament met; when the order was obey'd. The covenanted lords chose Sir *Alexander Lesley*, an old experienced soldier, for their generalissimo. Having review'd his troops, he march'd and encamp'd at *Dunee*, about six miles from *Berwick*; and the king lay a little on this side of that town. When the *Covenanters* army was ready to march, *Montrose* was dispatched into the north against the earl of *Aboyne*, the marquis of *Huntley*'s second son, who had taken the field with three thousand foot and five hundred horse: but *Montrose* made himself master of the loyal town of *Aberdeen*. Upon the march of the two armies, after several messages on both sides, a peace

was negotiated, and the troops were disbanded. In this treaty, the king granted them a free general assembly for the 6th of *August* following; and a meeting of the parliament, in which he was to be present in person, on the 20th of the same month, in order to ratify all the acts of that assembly. This peace was concluded on the 18th of *June*. Some very pressing affairs requiring his majesty's return to *London*, he deputed the earl of *Traquair* to represent him both in the assembly and parliament.

The general assembly was open'd at *Edinburgh* on the 12th of *September*, and confirm'd the acts of the assembly of *Glasgow*. The assembly then presented a petition to the earl and council, with solemn assurances of their loyalty; desiring that, according to the laudable example of their ancestors in 1581, all his majesty's subjects of *Scotland* should sign the *Covenant*, as a testimony of their fidelity to GOD and the king; which was granted, and an order issued out for that purpose. During this assembly, the bishops of *Dunkel* and the *Orkneys* abjured episcopacy. This being an unprecedented action, our historian gives us the abjuration of the latter at full length.

The assembly broke up on the 30th of *August*, and order'd another to be held at *Aberdeen* on the 20th of *July* 1640. The earl of *Traquair* then open'd the parliament; wherein affairs became more perplexed and desperate than ever. After some complaints from both sides, the earl adjourned the parlia-

parliament about the end of November, which, however, protested against the adjournment. Whereupon the earl hasten'd to court; and the *Covenanters* sent their deputies to the king, to require reparation of the injuries done them since the pacification; such as breaking up the parliament without their consent; an action for many ages without example, and a manifest violation of their laws and liberties: keeping numerous garrisons; and the *Scots* trading in *England* and *Ireland*, being oblig'd to take an oath which condemn'd their *Covenant*. To these instructions they added an ample declaration for informing the *English* of the matter of their complaints.

As the parliament was to sit in the month of *April*, 1640, an impeachment was drawn up against the earl of *Lowdon*, prisoner in the *Tower*, on account of a letter written by the *Covenanters* to the king of *France* for succours, and signed by that nobleman: but *Lowdon* answer'd the charge so artfully, that this affair came to nothing.

The king had, in this parliament, demanded a supply for chastising the *Covenanters*. This proved matter of strong debate. The lords were for the affirmative; but the commons stiffly oppos'd it; at least they insisted on the redress of grievances previous to the grant of any supplies, according to the ancient custom of parliaments; and affirm'd, that the power of levying money for the maintenance of some ships of war in the channel, which his majesty promised to give up for

supplies, was not acknowledged by parliament for a royal prerogative, but consider'd as an imposition contrary to all the laws. After much debate, the king, with the advice of his council, sent a message to the lower house, to demand twelve subsidies; on granting of which, he promised to put a stop to the levying of that money, which made so much noise. The person entrusted with this message was order'd to be contented with half the sum; but he did not follow directions. Whereupon the proposal was rejected with some warmth; and the king dissolved the parliament on the 5th of *May*.

While this parliament was sitting, the convocation met, and made several canons in defence of his majesty's supremacy, and for uniformity of the publick worship. They likewise drew up an oath, to be taken by all ecclesiastics, for the maintenance of the establish'd church. These were all authorized by the king's letters patent.

The *Covenanters*, hearing the *English* parliament had been dissolved, and being inform'd, that they had been charged with rebellion, without being heard; that their commissioners had been made prisoners; that their ships had been arrested in the ports of *England* and *Ireland*; that preparations were carrying on in those two kingdoms for making war upon them; that the parliament of *Ireland* had declared them rebels; and that the garrison of *Edinburgh* committed hostilities on the city and its inhabitants; resolved to

to provide for their own security. In this view, they block'd up the castle of *Edinburgh*, and obliged the governor to surrender, tho' on honourable terms, for want of provisions. Some other places, that held out for the king, were taken about the same time.

The parliament met in *Scotland*, without waiting for the king's order; and lord *Burly* was chosen president of it. No ecclesiasticks were admitted there; it was declared, that the lords, gentlemen, and burgeses of towns composed the three estates of the kingdom; and that their commissioners now, and for all time coming, were, and should be, the lawful meeting of the parliament, which hath full power to determine all things that concern the publick good of the kingdom. The same parliament confirmed and ratified the *Covenant*, with all the acts of the general assembly of *Edinburgh*. It likewise order'd, that all the parishes, of which the bishops had been patrons, should for the future be provided by the presbyteries; and made void and null all those proclamations and orders of council which had represented the meetings and leagues of the *Covenanters*, as acts of rebellion. The same parliament order'd, that the governors of the castles of *Edinburgh*, *Dumbarton*, and *Stirling*, should be named by the king, with the advice of parliament, or of the council, if the parliament was not then sitting; and that those governors should hold their posts only till the next parliament. An act was then made for triennial parliaments;

and another for a committee, which, being chosen out of the three estates, should always sit, and be divided into two parts; one of which to be with the army; the other at *Edinburgh*, or elsewhere, according to the exigency of affairs. This committee was invested with full power in the government of the state, and in the orders of war, without prejudice to the court of sessions, and other inferior courts of justice. The parliament was then adjourned to the 19th of *November*.

While this parliament was sitting, the *Covenanters* raised an army of between seventeen and eighteen thousand men; which general *Lesley* order'd to rendezvous at *Dunee*. The earl of *Gallender* was lieutenant-general of those forces. On the other hand, the king furnish'd *Berwick*, *Hull* and *Newcastle* with all sorts of ammunition and provisions; sent a fleet to the coast of *Scotland*; and order'd his army to rendezvous at *York*, appointing the earl of *Stratford*, lord-lieutenant of *Ireland*, commander in chief. During these transactions, the general assembly was open'd at *Aberdeen*, on the 18th of *July*, without any commissioner from the king; which gave order for demolishing every thing that they thought looked like the remains of idolatry; such as crucifixes, &c. Another was appointed to be held at *St. Andrew's*, on the 20th of *July* 1641.

The marquis of *Montrose* now thought the *Covenanters* had gone too far, and resolved to go over to the king; but matters were not

not yet ripe for the execution of that design. The Scots army decamped from *Dunee*, passed the river *Tweed* on the 21st of *August*, and met with no opposition till they came to *Newburn*, about six miles from *Newcastle*; to which place the earl of *Strafford* had detached lord *Conway*, with two thousand five hundred horse, and a thousand foot, to oppose their passing the *Tyne*. In this contest, which ended in favour of the enemy, the *Covenanters* took three of the most gallant officers prisoners, viz. colonel *Wilmot*, Sir *John Digby*, and *O Neal*, an *Irish* gentleman. This battle was fought on the 28th of *August*, and open'd the wealthy town of *Newcastle* to the *Covenanters*, who, some days after, put a garrison into *Durham*; and, having taken a fort upon the *Tyne*, below *Newcastle*, seized some ships that had been loaded with corn for the king's army.

In the mean time, the king had, by publick proclamation, summoned the *English* nobility and gentry to meet him at *York*; and appear there in arms, with their vassals, on the 20th of *September*. Here his majesty receiv'd a petition from the *Covenanters*, full of protestations of their fidelity; but the king, thinking their expressions too general, desired their demands might be more distinctly specified. While this was doing, a letter was sent to the king, sign'd by twenty earls and barons of *England*; wherein they represented to his majesty the deplorable state of the kingdom, and the miseries attending this war; to remedy

which, they most humbly beg'd of his majesty to call a free parliament as soon as possible, that the differences between him and his subjects might be there accommodated without effusion of blood. This being presented on the 24th of *September*, the king convened his lords at *York*; and, having declared his intention of calling a parliament at *London*, on the 3d of *November* following, ask'd their advice about a proper answer to the *Covenanters*. The lords, after several overtures proposed, concluded, that his majesty should give full power to sixteen of them for treating with the *Covenanters* about a peace. The king agreeing to this, the *Covenanters* were desired to depute the same number of their nobility, to whom an ample safe-conduct was sent. Pursuant to this agreement, the treaty was held at *Rippon*, and the following articles were settled: " That
 " there should be a truce and cessation of arms for two months;
 " during which time one thousand pounds a day should be paid to the *Covenanters* army: That,
 " on default of payment, the *Covenanters* might levy it by force on the counties of *Northumberland*, *Cumberland*, *Westmoreland*, and the bishoprick of *Durham*: That the *Covenanters* should have those counties for their winter-quarters:
 " That no preparations of war should be made during the truce: That private offences and injuries should not break it; and that the merchants should traffick freely in both kingdoms, without a passport;
 " but
 A a a

“ but that the soldiers should not
 “ be allow’d to go without their
 “ quarters.

About this time the parliament was open’d at *London*, which attack’d some of the chief officers of the crown, and the most eminent of the prelates. *Laud*, archbishop of *Canterbury*, and the earl of *Strafford*, were sent to the *Tower*; and *Dr. Wren*, bishop of *Norwich*, was charged with high treason. The acts and behaviour of this parliament being sufficiently known from our own historians, we shall give but little farther account of them here; and, through the whole, confine ourselves chiefly to the affairs of *Scotland*, mentioning only those of *England* which have a connexion with them.

The treaty of *Rippon* was now removed to *London*; and the truce having been prolonged to the month of *June* 1641, the commissioners then enter’d into a conference. The *Covenanters* began with a declaration of the independency of *Scotland* on the parliament of *England*, as a judge of their persons or laws. They then gave in their demands, which were granted, without any modification that could give them the least ground of complaint. Their trade and religion were secured, the freedom and power of their parliament were guarded, the expences of the war were defray’d, and several other articles were allow’d, which were of the last importance to the kingdom of *Scotland*. But the *English* parliament, jealous of the royal army, would not, as long as it continued standing, consent

to that of the *Covenanters* leaving *England*, tho’ it was so chargeable to the nation; and had recourse to a large poll-tax for supporting it.

About the middle of the year 1641, the *Covenanters* talk’d of demolishing the castle of *Edinburgh*; *Montrose* opposed the motion. As they had before produced the copy of a letter from him to the king, and some time after intercepted letters from his majesty to that nobleman, it happen’d that he had only preserved a prison for himself.

The general assembly was open’d on the 27th of *July*, at *Edinburgh*. The earl of *Weems* was sent high-commissioner of it by the king; and presented a letter from his majesty, confirming the acts of the last assembly, exhorting the commissioners to a faithful discharge of their duty to him, and to the people committed to their charge. On the 9th of *August*, the assembly received a letter, sign’d by several ministers of *England*, congratulating the ministers of *Scotland* on the success of their labours in the work of reformation. Hoping to be very soon freed from the bishops yoke, they were deliberating in their assembly at *London* upon the form of ecclesiastical government, which must succeed episcopacy; approved most of what has been since called *independency*, and desired the assembly’s judgment on the affair. The *Scots*, in their answer, asserted the form of church-government by presbyteries and assemblies, as coming from *God*; and assured their brethren in *England*, that not one
 of

of them was of a different opinion. After which, the assembly order'd a letter of thanks to his majesty; and appointed the next assembly to be held at *St. Andrew's*, on the 27th of *July* 1642.

In the mean time, the king went into *Scotland*, where he held a parliament. Before they proceeded to business, it was order'd, that all the members should take and subscribe an oath, to give their opinions freely and faithfully upon all matters which should be proposed in that session; and contribute, with all their might, to promote the glory of God, and the peace of the kingdom; to preserve and defend the power and privileges of parliament, and the rights and liberties of the subject. This oath being taken, the articles of peace between the king and his *Scots* subjects and the two nations were ratified. The *Covenanters* had made a proposal for regulating the choice of officers of the crown, counsellors of state, and the court of session; which was referred to the king and parliament. After a long debate on this affair, the king declared, for himself and his successors, that hereafter, by the advice of parliament, when sitting, he would name worthy persons to fill up those employments; that in case of a vacancy, the parliament not sitting, he would chuse the counsellors of state by advice of his council; and those of the court of session by advice of that body: both which elections to depend on a plurality of voices. His majesty likewise consented, that these elections should be approved or made void at the

first meeting of the ensuing parliament; and that the patents of them should be given *ad vitam vel culpam*; all the officers being answerable for their administration to the king and parliament.

Pursuant to this regulation, the earl of *Lowdon* received the great seal; Sir *Alexander Gibson* was chosen lord-register, and Sir *James Galloway* master of requests. The treasury was put into commission; the other officers were continued and confirmed. The privy-council and court of session were filled in the same manner. Commissioners were named for provision of all benefices, upon the valuation of the tythes. In the close of this session, *Montrose* was set at liberty; and the parliament broke up on the 17th of *November*. This book ends with the beginning of the rebellion in *Ireland*.

The third book is filled with the opening and prosecution of the civil war in *England* in 1642, and part of the following year. The *Scots* had not concern'd themselves in the quarrel between the king and his *English* parliament, till their general assembly opened at *St. Andrew's*, *July* the 28th, 1642. The earl of *Dumfermling*, high-commissioner, presented his majesty's letter, written from *Leicester* on the 23d of the same month. It was full of expressions of tenderness for his *Scots* subjects, and assurances of protection of their religion and laws. This assembly received a declaration from the *English* parliament, setting forth their pacifick disposition, their zeal for reformation, and reflecting on the clergy in particular for opposing

posing that good work. The assembly, in their answer, encouraged and exhorted them to peruse the glorious task with vigour and resolution, as persons raised by God for that purpose.

The fourth book of the history before us begins with the marquis of *Montrose's* arrival in *England*, toward the middle of the year 1643; whose business was to inform the king of many things of great importance to the good of his service. The *Covenanters* were beginning to rise in *Scotland*; and, hearing that the affairs of the *English* parliament were in a bad situation, were inclined to espouse their quarrel. This he communicated to the queen, then at *Burlington*. On her coming to *York*, the duke of *Hamilton* arrived from *Scotland*, made her majesty an offer of his service, and advised a mild procedure with the rebels; but the marquis of *Montrose* insisted on reducing them by force. He was not heard; and the duke returned to *Edinburgh*; where he was still opposed by *Montrose* in that point. The designs of the *Covenanters* being open'd to that great man, with a view of engaging him in their party, he set out with lord *Ogilvie*, and got safe to *Oxford*; from which place the king was gone to the siege of *Glocester*. He waited on the queen, whom he found at *Oxford*, and acquainted her with the occasion of his journey; but her majesty took this for a false alarm. He then went to the king, and communicated to him the design form'd by the *Covenanters* of assisting the parliament of *England*; but his

majesty gave but little credit to the intelligence.

Here comes in the solemn *League and Covenant* between the two kingdoms, so well known to all, who have the least acquaintance with *English* history. This was accepted and confirmed by the parliament and general assembly of *Scotland*, on the 17th of *August*; who, at the same time, order'd all the subjects to swear to, and sign it. Our author, having produced the reasons alledg'd in justification of this *Covenant*, shews the falseness of their foundation. While preparations were making, and troops raising in *Scotland*, the king of *France* sent a letter to the privy-council of that kingdom, desiring them to give credit to what his messenger should impart to them from his most Christian majesty, and to give him contentment therein.

The king was return'd to *Oxford*, when he received advice from the duke of *Hamilton*, that the *Covenanters* were resolved to send an army into *England*. Surprized at this news, he called for *Montrose*, and commanded him to tell him freely what he thought fit to be done in this conjuncture. He propos'd levying some troops in *Ireland*, and transporting them to the western coast of *Scotland*. He beg'd, that orders might be given to the duke of *Newcastle*, to furnish him with as many horse as he could; and that he would send to the king of *Denmark* for a supply of men and ammunition, which that prince had offer'd him these two years; by which means he hop'd to form a party that would

would shake the *League*, and reduce his majesty's subjects to obedience. The king approved of the overture, and set about the work. The marquis of *Antrim* undertook to transport two thousand men into *Scotland* before the month of *April* in the following year; colonel *Cochran* was dispatch'd into *Denmark*; and the marquis himself was to carry the order to the duke of *Newcastle*. *Montrose*, to avoid jealousy, beg'd his majesty would name his nephew; prince *Maurice*, general of his forces in *Scotland*; of which he would accept of the post of lieutenant-general. The king approv'd of this advice, and his commission was made out accordingly.

The *Covenanters*, having taken possession of *Berwick*, in the month of *December*, and put a *Scots* garrison into it, as had been agreed by the two nations, general *Lesley* enter'd *England*, with the auxiliary troops, in the beginning of the following year; took the castle of *Wark* in *Northumberland*, and that of *Morpeth*; gain'd some other advantages in his march toward *York*, which he intended to besiege, and join'd the parliament army. This invasion occasion'd the famous parliament at *Oxford*; of which our author has given us a full account. In the mean time, *Montrose*, before he left that city, caused a declaration to be drawn up, in order to be subscribed by all the *Scots-men* there, as well for engaging them, as for discovering what party each man was disposed to take. By this they profess'd the utmost detestation of the abominable *League*

made between the two nations, and their firm resolution of opposing the rebels; humbly entreating the two houses of parliament, lawfully assembled at *Oxford*, to join with them, in requesting of his majesty, that all *Scots-men*, who should refuse to sign the said declaration, be driven out from among the king's faithful servants and loyal subjects, and reputed favourers of the rebels of the two kingdoms. This declaration was cheerfully subscribed by all the *Scots* nobility and gentry then at court, who made his majesty an offer of all in their power for his service.

Montrose reach'd *Durham* in the beginning of *March*; where he deliver'd the king's orders to the duke of *Newcastle*, who could furnish him only with one hundred horse, and two field-pieces. When he came to *Carlisle*, he found the nobility and gentry of those parts hearty in the king's cause, and ready to join him. He had then eight hundred foot, and two hundred horse; and was here furnish'd with two hundred more, and some companies of foot. Thus provided, he enter'd *Scotland* on the 14th of *April* 1644, and took the town of *Dumfries* without opposition; where he made some stay, to inform himself of the state of the kingdom, and get news of the marquis of *Antrim*: but he could get no intelligence of him, and the *English* refused to proceed any farther. Whereupon *Montrose* marched back to *Carlisle*; from whence having sent spies into *Scotland*, he join'd the *English*, who had deserted

serted him, and took the castle of *Morpeth*, and an important fort at the mouth of the *Tyne*, from the *Covenanters*.

The persons dispatched into *Scotland* returning to *Montrose*, gave him such an account of the state of affairs in that kingdom, as lost him the greatest part of his officers. Finding the few who remained, dispirited, he gave them the slip, and prepared for his return to *Scotland*, attended only by two gentlemen. He was disguised like a groom, leading a horse in his hand; and, through such difficulties as seem invincible, he reach'd the house of his cousin *Patrick Graham*, in *Perthshire*; from whence he dispatched his two companions, with letters to some of his friends. It was not long before he had the pleasure to hear the *Irish* were landed, and join'd by the *Highlanders*. He found means to let them know they must advance into the shire of *Athol*, where he expected to raise a considerable body of men. As soon as *Montrose* heard they were encamp'd about twenty miles from the place where he was, he caused the news of his arrival to be publish'd, for raising the drooping courage of the king's good subjects, and made his way to the camp. The *Irish* were about twelve hundred men; and the gentry of *Athol*, in two days time, made an addition of above eight hundred.

At the head of this army, he took the field, and marched to the river *Tay*, with a view of allowing the royalists an opportunity of joining him, as also of pre-

venting the *Covenanters* from meeting. In his march he was reinforced with about five hundred men, under the command of lord *Kilpant* and Sir *John Drummond*; who told him the *Covenanters* were assembled at *Perth*. *Montrose*, continuing his march all night, came within sight of the enemy by break of day, and resolved to give them battle, tho' under uncommon disadvantages in point of arms and ammunition, and over-number'd almost four to one. He drew up his men in three lines, giving them orders not to fire till they were close in with the enemy; muzzle to muzzle; and to the three ranks to fire all together, the first kneeling, the second stooping, and the third standing upright; and then to fall on the enemy sword in hand; and, as for such as had none, which was the case of the *Irish*, to make use of the butt-end of their muskets. His orders were punctually obey'd, and the *Covenanters* entirely routed, with the loss of two thousand killed on the spot, and many prisoners; while *Montrose* had only two men wounded. This surprising battle was fought on *Tipper-Moor*, *September* the 1st; and the gates of *Perth* were thrown open to the conqueror. Having obliged the inhabitants of that town to take an oath of fidelity to the king, he marched into the shires of *Angus* and *Merns*, where he was join'd by the earl of *Airly*, with his two sons, and all the men he could raise.

Montrose, continuing his march toward *Aberdeen*, found two thousand

land foot and five hundred horse in that neighbourhood, which he resolved to engage with his fifteen hundred foot and forty horse. Here again he gained a complete victory. This battle was fought on the 12th of September. The *Covenanters* lost above a thousand men, and *Montrose* had only five men killed, and about ten or twelve wounded. After three days stay at *Aberdeen*, he march'd through several shires, in hopes of being join'd by fresh forces; but was at last obliged to return to the *Highlands*. Here he form'd a resolution of carrying the war into the heart of *Argyle's* own country; for he could not expect the *Highlanders* would join

him till they were freed from that nobleman's yoke. On this and other considerations, he took that route, and, by so long marches, that in the middle of *December* he got within two miles of *Inverara*, *Argyle's* principal seat, where he himself then was. *Argyle*, surprized at his approach, made his escape by water; while *Montrose* divided his troops into three parties, in order to over-run all the lands belonging to the earl; which accordingly did him no small damage. These are the most remarkable transactions contain'd in the fourth book; but our readers may expect a farther account of this brave and wonderful general in our next.

ARTICLE XLIV.

OBSERVATIONS, *Critical and Miscellaneous, on several remarkable Texts of the OLD TESTAMENT. To which is added, A Commentary on the Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah: With an Appendix, concerning divers ancient religious Traditions and Practices, and the Sense of many Texts of Scripture, which seem to allude to, or express them.* By Samuel Harris, D. D. F. R. S. late his Majesty's Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. London; Printed for the Author's Widow; and sold by John Whiston, at Boyle's Head in Fleetstreet, 4to. Containing in all 263 Pages. 1735.

THERE have been, since the restoration of letters, so many learned men, who have spent their labours upon *Greek* and *Latin* literature, that this kind of learning seems now in a manner to be quite exhausted; so that they, who will acquire some reputation in the republic of letters, must open to themselves a new field, and walk through untrodden paths, that they may pre-

sent the publick with something new and uncommon. The *Hebrew* tongue will afford them matter enough for their lucubrations; for, notwithstanding the many and learned works that have been written upon this subject, it must be confess'd, that the knowledge we have of the *Jewish* literature is still very imperfect, and might be greatly improved.

The

The work before us is an instance of this: the reverend and learned Dr. *Harris* gives us a great many new observations and hints concerning the language, manners, and customs of the ancient *Jews*; which, as they shew that he had made that kind of learning his particular study, so they may, by being improved, serve to clear up a great number of passages in the Old Testament.

He begins his preface with observing, how difficult, or rather impossible, it is to account for the customs, manners, language and ideas of men who lived three or four thousand years ago, with the same perspicuity and certainty as if you had lived in those times yourselves. "The farther we
"are removed from the light of
"primeval antiquity, *says he*, by
"so much the shadow of things
"must necessarily lengthen upon
"us; and those who will de-
"mand of us answers to some
"hard questions, and insist posi-
"tively upon their being resolv'd,
"as being necessary to their be-
"lief of christianity, and the
"system of the Old Testament,
"may very possibly, and indeed
"very probably, ask for some-
"thing wherein they can never
"be resolved. But I am very
"sure, that such questions arise
"either from mere curiosity, or,
"what is worse, from a *scoffing*,
"which is really an infamous
"disposition; and the glorious
"gospel cannot be hurt by either
"of them.

Our author mentions afterwards some other dispositions of men, which are the causes of their infi-

delity; and, after a few reflections upon the order and harmony of this universe, which prove the being of a God, and the like order and harmony in the whole system of christianity, which are a sure proof of its divine original; he speaks of *Scepticism*, which he approves, as being a *bare inclination to enquire into the grounds and reason of every thing*. Such an enquiry, so long as it consists within the bounds of modesty and good manners, and treats not religious subjects with scoffing and indecency, cannot be looked upon as a fault, or a blameable action, in any wise and considering man.

Such a *Sceptick*, that is, a *modest enquirer after truth*, our author declares himself to be; in consequence of which, he has thrown the latter part of his book into *Queries*, as being doubts which he had not enough consider'd himself, and which he submits to the examination of the learned.

In the latter part of this preface we meet with some etymological observations; for which we must refer the reader to the author himself.

We arrive now to the work itself, which contains four dissertations, preliminary to the commentary upon the fifty-third chapter of *Isaiah*.

The first dissertation is on a *Gnozer*, or *Advocate*; who, says Dr. *Harris*, was always a considerable person, or a man of distinction, who went to the court of judicature, to which some of his acquaintance, or dependents, were cited; to present such a per-
son

son before the judges, to hear his cause fairly tried, and, upon some occasions, if he thought proper, to be a sponsor for his good behaviour, both past and future. "I don't say, adds our author, that this is a modern practice; the notion of an advocate, and of his character, has now long been alter'd." But that the notion he gives of a *Gnozer*, or *Advocate*, was ancient, and that it continued for a long time, is what he undertakes to prove.

The first authority he quotes, is that of *Isaiah*, ch. 1. ver. 7, 8, 9; which he explains in the following words:

"For the Lord will help me; WA-ADONAI JEHOVAH JAGNAZER LI: This verse should be translated, *The Lord Jehovah will be my Advocate; therefore shall I not be confounded; therefore have I set my face like a flint; and I know that I shall not be ashamed.* This last word *ashamed*, is a word of the *Forum*, or courts of justice; for a man, amongst the *Jews*, cast in a *soul cause*, was said to be *ashamed*. Numberless proofs of this might easily be produced; but it would not be worth while at present: most readers will find them for themselves.

"Ver. 8. He is near that justifies me; that is to say, there is one near that will maintain that I am just and honest; who will contend with me? --- let us stand together; who is mine adversary? Let him come near me.

"Ver. 9. AN ADONAI JE-

"HOVAH JAGNAZER LI: who is he that shall condemn me? for the Lord *Jehovah* is my *Advocate*; that is to say, he is the sponsor both for my past and my future behaviour.

"The whole of this passage is manifestly an allusion to the *Jewish* law-proceeds; wherein it appears, that there was a person who did sometimes, according as he judged of the merits of the party accused, appear in court to answer for his reputation, and be *responsible* for him. If this considerable person made good the prisoner's character to the satisfaction of the judges, the party accused was then, as far as I can guess, dismiss'd. The name of this advocate, in the *Hebrew* language, was *GNOZER* and *MATZEDIK*; or, in the *Greek* language, ο ΔΙΚΑΙΩΝ (ο Δικαίων) as may be seen from verse the 8th of this chapter last cited, and might be proved from many other instances. If his declaration for the criminal was accepted by the court, then he was called *CAPHER*, or *Ransom*.

Our author observes, upon this last word, that the considerable person he had mention'd became an exchange for the person accused; that being the sense of the *Hebrew* word *Capher*: and as all merchandizes among the ancients were generally managed by exchange of goods for goods, that word *Capher* has travelled very far into our modern languages. Thus we have in our *English* language the word *Chaffer*, or make

a Bargain. Hence came the name of *Cheapside* in London; and all the towns in England, which begin with the word *Chipping*, are market-towns; as *Chipping-Norton*, *Chipping-Onger*, &c.

As *Gnozer* and *Matzedik* are translated by the Greek word *o Dikaion*, this gives our author an handle to set a text of St. Paul in a better light than that wherein it has hitherto stood. "It is in chap. viii. of his *Epistle to the Romans*; wherein St. Paul lays it down as a sure position (v. i.) that *there is now no condemnation to them who are in Jesus Christ*. Which thesis he pursues with various arguments to verse the 33d; where he says, *Tis egkalesei kata Ekleeton Theon. Who shall accuse the Elect of God?* Why you will say perhaps himself. The next word must have a point of interrogation after it, *Theos?* What, GOD accuse them? Why this is impossible; for GOD is the *Gnozer*, the *Matzedik*, the *o Dikaion*; he is the *Justifier* of them. You may go on to say, *But CHRIST may condemn them*; the next word must still have a point of interrogation after it, *Christos?* What, CHRIST? Why this is as impossible again; for CHRIST is *o Apathanon*; he that died for them: how then should he condemn them?" Our author adds, that St. Paul writes very often in the manner of *Demosthenes*; in whose writings he had been conversant, and thereby gained a great conformity and likeness of style to him: wherefore they, who would understand

St. Paul well, must take the pains to consider that resemblance.

Dr. Harris undertakes afterwards to prove, that this good office [of an *Advocate*] was widely extended, and continued long; which he does, by explaining some passages in the Old Testament, especially *Job xxxiii.* 23, 24; and by observing, that the notion of an *Advocate* may be explained by that of a *Client*, to which word it is a relative.

The second dissertation is on a *Dour*, or *Generation*. The LXX always translate *Dour* *γενεα*, as our version does *Generation*. But our author thinks that this notion is too confined, the *Hebrew* word having relation to place as well as to time. This Dr. Harris proves by several observations.

He observes afterwards, that, amongst the ancients, there were books or registers kept of all who were born and died amongst them; the place of their abode, their occupations, and their genealogy. This register our author calls the *Book of Dour*; which, he thinks, was not unlike our *Dooms-day book* in England.

This custom of enrolling mankind was very ancient, as appears from the practice of the *Athenians*, who refer the origin of it to *Cecrops*. But as mankind were very early divided into two estates, of *Freemen* and *Slaves*, the former only were enter'd into these enrolments, as being the only persons who had a real interest in their country; the slaves being placed to their master's account, and consider'd as part of his wealth, as any other of his estates or chattels.

tels. Hence Dr. Harris observes, by the way, that tho' only eight persons were said to enter into Noah's Ark (whereof four only were men, and fit for labour) it may not be impossible, that, as these were heads of families, and so consequently only named, some servants might be taken into the ark with them: for such, doubtless, were assistant to Noah in the building of the vessel, who, by being long engaged with him in that work, must be informed by him (a preacher of righteousness) of the judgment which God was bringing upon the world; and therefore very likely concurred with him in his faith, and were equally objects of divine mercy. And therefore it is not impossible, that some of these might be taken into the ark with him; their hands probably being necessary for the management of it, during so great a storm, and for taking a proper care of so many living creatures as were preserved in it for so long a time; which, doubtless, must have been a work of great fatigue and labour. This will more easily account for the speedy peopling of the world after the deluge; and I find, adds our author, the very learned bishop Cumberland was of this opinion.

He proceeds to shew, that the notion he gives of a *Dour*, as having relation to place as well as to time, is conformable to what we find in the Bible. We shall quote here but one of our author's arguments, which is his explanation and paraphrase (if I may so call it) of *Psalms* the lxxxviii. "The LXX, says he, seems not

"to have understood one tittle
"of its meaning. Those, who
"know that *Tzion* means the
"state of the christian church al-
"most always in the *Psalms*, as
"many learned men have re-
"mark'd before me, will soon
"perceive the beauties and sense
"of this *Psalms*. *The Lord loveth*
"*the gates of Tzion more than all*
"*the dwellings of Jacob.* This,
"I suppose, no christian at this
"time of day will pretend to
"dispute, or doubt of; for where
"are now the dwellings of *Ja-*
"*cob*? *Glorious things are said of*
"*thee, O city of God.* This
"verse needs no comment, the
"former being a sufficient illus-
"tration of it. Ver. 4. *I will*
"*make mention of Rahab and Ba-*
"*bylon to them that know me.*
"The LXX, and our transla-
"tion, which too often follows
"them, certainly mis'd the scope
"and intention of this verse;
"for the sense of the *Hebrew* is
"plainly this: I will place some,
"even in *Rahab* and *Babylon*, to
"the account, or in the number of
"*such as know me.* This sounds,
"to me, as if it was supposed by
"the *Psalms*, that God was
"giving a direction to his angels,
"his ministers for the good of
"men, to observe the various
"parts of the earth, and to make
"a report of the behaviour of the
"several inhabitants. Look at
"*Palestine*, or *Tyre*, or *Ethiopia*,
"such a one, or such a one, was
"born there, who having led a
"regular and good life, and con-
"sequently having obtained a
"good report, is order'd to be re-
"corded in such registers, as are
"kept

“ kept above, as an object worthy
 “ of the divine favour. This
 “ was a hard proposition for the
 “ *Jews* to digest; and therefore
 “ it is no wonder, if the LXX
 “ either could not, or would not,
 “ understand it. The *Jews* had
 “ confined the bounty of God
 “ Almighty’s goodness to a very
 “ narrow and unworthy com-
 “ pass; and there is a very ma-
 “ nifest difference between the
 “ spirit of scripture, and the spi-
 “ rit of those who, in after-ages,
 “ interpreted it.

“ But let God be his own in-
 “ terpreter, who long ago pro-
 “ claimed his style, *The Lord God*
 “ *merciful, long-suffering, and*
 “ *abundant in goodness and truth.*
 “ And this style of his we, of this
 “ age, may very easily perceive
 “ to be exceedingly just; and
 “ should, surely, acknowledge it
 “ accordingly. And it was well
 “ understood in the first ages of
 “ the gospel; and in particular
 “ this proposition was revealed
 “ unto St. Peter (a zealous *Jew*,
 “ and as apt to follow the prepos-
 “ sessions of his countrymen, as
 “ any one well could be) that
 “ *in every nation he that feareth*
 “ *God, and worketh righteousness,*
 “ *is accepted with him.*

“ I come now to verse the 5th,
 “ *But of Zion shall be said,* that
 “ is to say of the christian church,
 “ that not only one or two, that
 “ is to say some few, but ISH-
 “ WEISH; that is to say, every
 “ man shall be recorded there, as
 “ born to the service and wor-
 “ ship of the true God. *Ish-Weish* is
 “ the same construction with *Dour-
 “ we Dour*; and what that is, is
 “ well known.

“ The last verse of this fine
 “ *Psalms* is, I doubt, corrupted;
 “ and, as I am afraid, beyond all
 “ hopes of recovery. However,
 “ what I have affirm’d, I think,
 “ is plain enough; that herein is
 “ contained a manifest allusion to
 “ these writings, records, or en-
 “ rolments, wherein men were
 “ enregister’d, according to their
 “ several *Dours* or *Habitations*.

Dr. Harris tells us, in the close
 of this dissertation, that he has
 made great use of the *Psalms* in
 his essay upon the fifty-third chap-
 ter of *Isaiah*; because he thinks
 many of them; or, it may be, the
 greater part of them, are literal
 prophecies relating to our Saviour,
 applicable to him, and to no one
 else. “ When I say to him, adds
 “ he, and him only, I do not ex-
 “ clude his church, because of its
 “ near relation to himself. But
 “ then it must be observed, that
 “ many things will be true of
 “ him, personally, which cannot
 “ be apply’d to his church; many
 “ things will be true of his church,
 “ which cannot be apply’d to him
 “ personally; and many things
 “ true of both together, consider’d
 “ as a *people*, or as one moral or
 “ political person.

The third dissertation treats of
 the ancient method of propounding
 important points by way of ques-
 tion. *Vitringer*, in his explication
 of the fifty-third chapter of *Isaiah*,
 introduces a chorus of *Jews* talk-
 ing with the prophet; whereby
 the whole of it becomes a drama-
 tick piece. But Dr. Harris does
 not admit that notion: he thinks,
 that the ancient *Jews* knew no-
 thing of this dramattick way of
 writing,

writing, it being a thing of much later invention. 'Tis true, the chapter begins with an interrogation; *Who has believed our report?* But our author thinks it may be accounted for in a much easier manner.

He observes, that the wisdom of the ancients, by which generally is to be understood what we now call *learning*, usually appear'd in the form of hard questions; to which the proponent demanded a solution. This the author proves by some instances, as that of the queen of *Sheba*, who came to prove *Solomon* with hard questions, 1 Kings x. 1.

The other instance, upon which our author dwells longer, is taken from the author of *Ecclesiastes*, ch. vi. ver. 10. *That which has been named already, and it is known, that his name is man; neither may he contend with him that is mightier than he.* "This text,"

says Dr. Harris, when rightly construed, will fully explain the argument that now lies upon our hands, it tallying exactly with the first text of the fifty-third of *Isaiah*, as for syntax and construction; and for that reason I cited it. Now,

That which has been named already, is in *Hebrew*, MAH SHE-HAH CEBAR; and it ought to be translated by way of interrogation, and in another sense, viz. thus: *What is that which exists but for a moment?*

The author of this book uses the *Shin* frequently as a servile prefix, as the grammarians call it; and its sense is demonstrative, it signifying in *English*

that: and, in this place, its sense is, *What is THAT that exists, &c?*

The next word, *Cebah*, I translate a moment, or a very little time. This sense is almost peculiar to this author; in other parts of scripture we find a word (*Cebrah*) of the same family and tribe, which signifies a little way; from whence we may conclude, that the original idea of the word is founded in something which signified littleness; from whence it became applicable either to a very little time, or a very little way.

I come now to the hard question or riddle in this author; *What is that which exists but for a moment?* What is that which exists, as it were, but for a twinkling of an eye?

The next words which follow are, *Nikra Shemo*; which is the author's solution, and must be paraphras'd thus: *What, do you propound this as a riddle, or a hard question? --- 'Tis no such thing; Nikra Shemo*, the name of this thing, which you enquire after, has been named by thousands and thousands, *Wenadang asher Hou, Adam*; that is to say, it is well known what that is, it is *man*. Alas! man is like a thing of naught, his time passes away like a shadow.

The essay upon the fifty-third chapter of *Isaiah* is pretty long, and contains not only a commentary upon each verse of that chapter, but also an explication of several other passages in scripture,

especially in the *Psalms*; which, with the sense our author puts upon them, serve to illustrate the prophecy of *Isaiah*. It is impossible to abridge that essay; we must therefore content ourselves with laying before the reader our author's explication of one of the most difficult passages in this prophecy.

It is verse the 8th, which, in our translation, runs thus: *He was taken from prison, and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was he smitten.* Dr. Harris gives us his observations and commentary upon this verse by way of dialogue, for the relief of his reader's patience.

He observes, *First*, That as he explained the other parts of this chapter of our Saviour, this also must be applied to him. *Secondly*, That our Saviour was never put in prison; how then could he be said to be taken from prison? *Thirdly*, This text seems to lie amongst the hardships done to some remarkable person; nay, what is still more, it lies in the very middle of them, and is follow'd by many others; in the close of which are related the rewards he should meet with for his patient enduring of them. But how could it be conceived, that the taking any man out of prison should be deem'd a hardship, especially when it was in order to reward him in so glorious a manner, as we find represented towards the close of this chapter.

Dr. Harris then examines what

Vitranga, *Grotius* and *St. Jerome* say upon this verse; and, not liking their expositions, he proceeds to give his own.

He observes, that, in *Job xxvii.* 2. it is said, *As the Lord liveth who has taken away my judgment;* and in *ch. xxxiv. 5.* *For Job has said I am righteous, and God has taken away my judgment.* "In

both these texts, adds he, the words *Lukach* and *Mishpat* occurring, it plainly appears to me, that our blessed Saviour was prophesied of in *Isaiah*, as one who should be deprived of his just trial. And a fair trial was the privilege and benefit of prisoners, as freeing them from the outrageous and lawless execution of the mob, by delivering them over to the hearing and sentence of an impartial judge. 'Tis true indeed, the judge himself may not be impartial; and this was the case of our Saviour: he had mob enough about him in that famous night to torment him, who carried him to judges, who misused and tormented him still more; so that the prophet might very justly say, in the same meaning as *Job* did, his judgment was taken away from him; he had no fair, or impartial, or regular hearing.

Having thus ascertained the true sense of the word *Lukach*, continues our author, I shall be able to deal the better with the rest. Now, it is my opinion, that the word *Gnotzer*, which we truly translate *prison*, is a corruption in the text; for to

talk

talk of a man's being deprived of a prison is absurd; and, besides, as I have said before, it is notorious, that our Saviour never was in one. It is indeed a corruption of a very ancient date; for the *Septuagint* follow'd a very bad text.

Dr. Harris shews afterwards how the text of the Old Testament might have been corrupted in some places by the carelessness or ignorance of the transcribers.

And how could it have happened otherwise, says he, when in writing out books one man read, in all probability, to ten or a dozen scribes, who were all illiterate, and unacquainted with the subject of the book they were copying; and perhaps were not concern'd for any thing more than to earn two or three shillings a day?

Now, as they wrote from sound, they must consequently mistake many, and spell many words wrong, and transmit them in a lame condition to posterity. So that, in many cases, we must of necessity be left to our guesses; and many lucky guesses have been made by our modern critics, not only upon the New, but also on the Old Testament: and I wish there had been more various readings preserved in *Hebrew MSS.* for their direction and assistance.

I say then, that in this text you must read instead of *Gnotzer*, *Gnozer*; words which differ very little in sound, and which might easily be changed the one for the other, especially in a text of difficult interpreta-

tion, and, as it is very likely, not at all understood by any of the transcribers of it; for many of them were, at best, but dunces.

The next words in the text are, *And who shall declare his generation?* Grotius translates it, *Who shall declare the wickedness of that generation wherein he lived?*

Now, says our author, *wickedness* is a material word; it must not be inserted into a text where it is not to be found. The whole sense of that passage is clearly determin'd by that word; and, if it be not there, you do not find a sense, but make one; which is meddling too boldly with a sacred author; and, to say the truth, is a liberty not to be allow'd even the incomparable Grotius himself. I might, with equal reason, insert the word *goodness* into the text, and so change Grotius's sense into quite its opposite; that is to say, in short, neither he, nor I, nor any man living, can have a right to add such material words as these, which specify and fix the sense of a text, when we do not find them there: for that is not explaining your author, but writing for him. What, was there no word in the *Hebrew* language to express *wickedness* by? And shall any man persuade me, that the prophet would not have made use of it, if that had been his sense?

Our author proceeds afterwards to lay before us his own explication of these words; which he modestly gives as possible only, and not

not certain. " I have told you
 " already, says he, that the pro-
 " phet has said, that in this un-
 " fair tryal our Saviour should be
 " deprived of two essential things
 " in an affair of justice, viz. of
 " his *Advocate*; which was the
 " first in order; and then of his
 " *Trial*, which was the second.

Hence our author infers, that
 some third misery of our Saviour
 was intended by the prophet. " I
 " infer it, says he, from the He-
 " brew particle *W'e-eth*; which is
 " conjunctive, and of the same
 " sense and interpretation with
 " our *English* word *with*; and,
 " to say the truth, 'tis altogether
 " the same word, as any one,
 " who understands languages, will
 " soon perceive. So that the pro-
 " phet has said, that our Saviour
 " should be deprived of his *Advo-*
 " *cate*, and of his *Trial* or *Judg-*
 " *ment*, together with some other
 " things; which loss made his
 " third hardship, and which we
 " are now to enquire into.

" I will tell you, that *Mise-*
 " *shacheach Dour* must not be
 " translated, *Who shall declare his*
 " *generation*? For such a version
 " is forcing a sense upon the
 " words, which they do not natu-
 " rally import; and all violence
 " is a great sign of mistake: but
 " the true meaning is, *He was*
 " *deprived of one who should de-*
 " *clare his Dour*. And that was
 " his third hardship. But I must
 " enlarge a little upon this sub-
 " ject. Now you know, that
 " in all civilized nations, after
 " the evidence had been given in
 " against the prisoner, and the
 " plea almost ended, before sen-

tence was pronounced, he had
 " the benefit of calling in wit-
 " nesses to his reputation; which
 " was always the last part
 " of his defence. You, who
 " have frequently read the in-
 " comparable pleadings of *Tully*
 " and *Demosthenes*, can be no
 " stranger to this practice; and
 " you know it is now allow'd in
 " *England*, and I believe in every
 " other well-regulated nation:
 " and the *Jewish* law, in par-
 " ticular, was tender and good-
 " natur'd, always favouring the
 " prisoners, as far as it was pos-
 " sible; as may be easily collected
 " from the learned *Mr. Selden's*
 " book *De Synedriis*. And, to say
 " the truth, there was a natural
 " equity in this practice, which
 " will always justify it; for it
 " was but fair to call in some
 " persons, in whose neighbour-
 " hood the man had lived, to see
 " if they would witness to his
 " good and honest behaviour be-
 " fore the court: and this, as
 " you know, has saved many a
 " man's life, who might other-
 " wise have been oppress'd by the
 " malice and perjury of false wit-
 " nesses. Now it was necessary,
 " that these witnesses should be
 " of the prisoner's *Dour*, or neigh-
 " bourhood; men able to declare
 " with what sort of a character
 " he had lived amongst them,
 " and if they believed well of
 " him. But this benefit our Sa-
 " viour upon his tryal had not;
 " for when false witnesses rose up
 " against him, *Peter* flatly denied
 " him; and all his other disciples,
 " who could have been witnesses
 " to the mildness of his behavi-
 " our,

our, were so terrified, that they
 forsook him and fled: so that
 he had no body to appear in
 court for him. And I am so
 fully persuaded of the outrage
 and violence of that very
 wicked court, and of their de-
 sperate resolution to murder
 our Saviour, that I can easily
 believe they pass'd that form of
 law, and called for no witnesses
 to his reputation: and, pro-
 bably, if any had appeared,
 they would have been equally
 their murderers, as they were
 of our Saviour. And now, I
 think, I have said enough to
 set this famous text to rights.
 I could have said a great deal
 more upon it; but what is done
 may be sufficient. I have told
 you, that our Saviour is here
 prophesied of, as one who
 should be deprived of three
 material and essential things,
in foro judicii, viz. of his *Ad-
 vocate*, which was ever the first
 in order; secondly, of his
Hearing, or *fair Tryal*, which
 was the second; and, lastly,
 of his *Witnesses*, who were to
 declare his *Doom*, or place of
 habitation: and by these means
 and methods *he was cut off out
 of the land of the living.*

This is sufficient to give the
 reader a notion of Dr. Harris's
 essay or commentary upon the
 fifty-third chapter of *Isaiab*. The
 appendix, which contains above
 one fourth of this volume, may
 be divided into two parts; the
 first containing some grammatical
 observations upon several *Hebrew*
 words; the other being eighty-
 nine *Queries* proposed by our au-
 thor, and relating to the necessity
 of a divine revelation; to God's
 being esteemed, in a proper and
 strict sense, the King of mankind;
 to his several dispensations in that
 relation; to the appearance of
 angels, and the manner in which
 they appeared; to several ancient
 traditions, and a great many other
 religious subjects. In all these *Que-
 ries*, Dr. Harris gives us very useful
 hints, and opens a large field to
 those who have the learning and
 genius requisite to follow his steps;
 but it is impossible to give a parti-
 cular account of this part of his
 book, without transcribing almost
 the whole appendix: we must
 therefore refer the reader to the
 book itself; and we may safely
 say, that whoever peruses it, will
 not think his time ill spent.

Ccc

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XLV.

A VINDICATION of Dr. Morgan's *Mechanical Practice of Physick*, &c. against the Cavils and Exceptions of the Author of Article XII. in the LITERARY MAGAZINE of July 1735.

NE SUTOR ULTRA CREPIDAM.

THE author, in this article, has taken me severely to task; and seems resolved to make a publick example of me, to the eternal shame and utter confusion of all those who, in time to come, might attempt to advance any thing clear and rational in physick, to the prejudice of experienced quacks, specifick empyricks, recipe-retailers, and common-place-men in the faculty.

I debated for some time with myself, whether I should take any notice of such an adversary, or not; but several of my friends persuaded me, that tho' he had offer'd nothing at all of argument, yet it might be of some use to expose his dogmatical blunders and false wit: and this, at last, determined me to treat the gentleman as he deserves, and to return some of his compliments upon him, tho' with more reason and justice.

This orthodox writer would seem to be infinitely fond of authority, while he hereby means nothing but his own authority; or, which amounts to the same, the authority of those who are of his mind. But perhaps he will say, that he means the authority of the present professors, and the modern practice as it now stands: and upon this foot he would put

it to the vote, whether I am right or wrong? or whether the principles I have advanced are true or false? And this would be, doubtless, a notable trial of truths, which might serve well enough for an ecclesiastical synod; but no-body could have expected it from a physician. But, suppose he should put it to the vote, as to any article in debate between him and me, how can he secure a majority? I hope he will call a general council, and not bring me upon trial before a Junta of his own. But let him chuse any ten physicians of the least character and credit in England, and I would venture ten to one of a majority against him, provided I might speak for myself.

This negotiator could surely make nothing now of physical truth and orthodoxy, as it stood in modern practice about forty years ago; and what present premium will he take to deliver a certain quantity of it at a given price forty years hence? I do not here doubt of the richness of his understanding; but I believe he has prudence enough to take care how he would part with his money. But 'tis time to dismiss this business of authority, and to try the strength of our author's reasonings; for, doubtless, he would be

thought

thought in the right, whether authority should be for or against him. And here it would be well for mankind, if such little spiteful animals would never hiss till they could sting; for then they need not give themselves and the world so much trouble to prove, that geese are serpents.

Now here one grand charge is, that in my younger years I had studied divinity, and preached christianity; which is a demonstration, *a priori*, that I had never studied physick, and am not fit to practise it: for who can imagine, that religion, especially the christian religion, can be consistent with the modern practice of physick? What, a physician, and a christian! Pray, Sir, pardon me; for the characters are incompatible. No more therefore of your religion in physick.

Another great charge is, want of politeness and sufficient accuracy in style and language: but, as I never pretended to any extraordinary talents in this way, I hope the critick will forgive me; or, at least, till he can acquit himself of all such slips and errors, either of his own or the printer's. I never corrected the press for myself; and yet have never publish'd any thing that would not bear the perusal of a patient reader.

Another charge is, that in my physical works I have presumed to make some new words, and endeavoured to convey clear and distinct ideas by them, without the leave of this author. But, to stop his rage, and prevent his farther indignation upon this, I must beg his pardon; and can assure

him, that those words were never made for him.

These are the general charges, in which the author has taken a great deal of unprofitable pains; and will come off well, if he should be thought as wise a man as he had been deem'd before: but he did not intend to let me off at this rate; and therefore, having shut his eyes, and resolv'd never to mind the mark, he comes, in the next place, directly to the point; for he knew that he could not for shame pretend to confute a book, without taking any notice of it.

I had indulged myself in some raillery against a modern weak and vicious character in the practice of physick; and I happen'd to introduce this character under the name of *Paracelsus*, which was the first quack-name that came into my head; tho' I might as well have used any other, especially had I known this author's name. But here our physical critick runs into a vein of wit, which gives one shrewd suspicions of some hurt in his intellects; for, upon this occasion, he suffers his wit to run beyond his senses, and most absurdly applies what I had said in general to *Paracelsus* personally; and this, without being able to shew that I had not described a character in present life, or that the ridicule was not just. But, suppose there were no apothecaries in *Paracelsus*'s time, there were certainly mercenary empiricks, retailing practising druggits, specifick mad-men, and idle impertinent collectors and publishers of recipe's in his time; and perhaps

haps their number may be since vastly increased. This is the character which I had touch'd; and I am sorry the author should be so sensible of the sting.

I had proved, *an posteriori*, not from plain facts, that nothing can pass the lacteals, or any of the recipient lymphatics, but in the form of a fine imperceptible vapour; and consequently that it must be either a fluid, or a solid evaporated, attenuated and suspended in a fluid, so as to pass together with the fluid itself in particles less than the orifices of such recipient vessels. It had been proved also, from undeniable facts and experiments, that all bodies, whether solid or fluid, by certain degrees of heat and motion, are capable of a separation and division of their parts to any assignable degree of exiguity; and that, as matter in its own nature is infinitely divisible, so no possible bounds can be set to this actual division and separation of its parts. It had been likewise proved, that the particles of *Gamboge*, *Rhubarb*, *Antimony*, *Sulphur*, *Mineral Globes*, *Metallic Calces*, &c. appear to sight and by inspection to be vastly larger than the mouths of the lacteals and recipient lymphatics all over the body; and that, after these substances have undergone the utmost force of fire, trituration, grinding, &c. or degrees of heat and motion, vastly superior to the natural digestive heat and motion of the stomach; which is but a mild warm close infusion, not exceeding the natural heat of the blood: and from hence it was concluded, that these and such

like substances, in their natural form, are not capable of passing the lacteals, and acting as alteratives upon the blood, by any laws of motion, mechanism, and chemistry hitherto known; so that we could judge of it and reason about.

But, since the author contradicts all this, denies the conclusiveness of the argument, and pretends to reason against it, it may be fit to consider what he hath said now while he is in the humour of it, and lest he should never be caught at the time of reasoning more. There may be some danger of such a delinquency, tho' no body knows whether he will take this for a warning. Having therefore thus mention'd my argument as before recited, he adds, p. 343: "This is a demonstration which it may be dangerous to examine too closely, lest it drop asunder in our hands. It seems indeed composed of inconsistent elements, and to carry in itself the principles of its own destruction. To prove that nothing can pass the lacteals but as a fluid, we are referred to two solid bodies, which may pass; for that gold and silver, however dissolved, are not fluids, but solids, Dr. *Morgan* will scarcely deny: metals do not lose their solid nature by being comminuted or reduced into smaller masses: gold, when dissolv'd in *Aqua Regia*, is still the same solid gold as before; and, by exhaling the menstruum, returns to its former figure and appearance, without any loss of substance.

"What

What then should hinder gold, when reduced into particles less than the blood-globules, less than the mouths of the lacteals, even than those of the smallest secretory microscopical ducts, from passing the lacteals?

Now one would think, from hence, that this author and I had some grand debate between us concerning the abstract metaphysical natures, and internal real essences of solids and fluids; or how far fluids, by rest and attraction, may be converted into solids; and then, by heat and motion, reduced to their former fluidity again. I know not how this question came into his head; but, I am sure, it was never in mine; and I believe, after all, he is as incapable of resolving it, as if he had never started it; but I should not care to ramble after him as often as he would lead me out of the way. I had proved, that solids are capable of being so far resolved, diffused, and suspended in water, as to pass together with the fluid into the finest recipient ducts; and he here very pertinently asks me, why this may not be true? or why I may not be in the right? But I have no controversy with this gentleman about metaphysical solidity and fluidity. If he will but allow me, that common water is a fluid, and that solid gold is not a fluid, this concession will be enough, and all that I should desire of him. But thus much, I think, is certain, that this author must have had some other reasons for not entering closer into this argument, besides his tender-

ness for me; and, among other reasons, 'tis very probable, that he might have these two very substantial ones. *First*, Because he was not capable of it himself; and, in the next place, because he had no friend in the world that could assist him in it, and help him out.

But the learned author soon saw, that the concessions he was forced to make here might be dangerous; and therefore, not being able to lessen the diameters of his solid pulveriz'd particles, he was resolved to widen the mouths of the lacteals, in order to make room for particles of what size he thought fit, which might do as well. For what I had supposed of the fineness of the lacteals, is not, it seems, consistent with the demonstrations of anatomists, who shew them to the naked eye. Some of them *Hwyer* has found as big as pack threads. In persons who have died soon after eating, and whose bodies have been open'd ere cold, the lacteals are always seen full, and not of an insensible aura, but of a visible lactescent juice, or chyle. By this means it was that *Arcellius* first discover'd them.

That the lacteals discover themselves to the eye, when filled with chyle, which shews itself in its white milky colour through the thin transparent coats of these vessels, is very true; but then they are thus seen in their large bundles or whole compages, and not in their single tubes and orifices; nor does any anatomist pretend to have

have seen them thus singly and separately, by the help of any microscope whatever.

The lacteals and lymphatics; when empty of a colour'd liquor; tho' they may be flowing with other liquor, are invisible to a microscope which magnifies as 500 to 1 in diameter; and I suppose a small packthread not to exceed $\frac{1}{2}$ of an inch. Now, since circles and sections are as the squares of their diameters, if the orifices of the lacteals are increased in the foregoing propositions, it must follow, that the surface in which they terminate would be increased; as above, 600 to 1, when the lacteals are filled and flowing with chyle. I just mention this, only to shew the absurdity and impossibility of his own supposition in fact, and not to frighten him with an argument, *à priori*, at the very apprehension or pannick fear of which he always starts and recoils.

But I could easily forgive this learned author all his ill-natur'd raillery and false wit, if he would tell me honestly and off-hand what an argument *à priori* is, and wherein it differs from an argument *à posteriori*; or if he could but say, what sort or kind his arguments are of; for, I doubt, he would want a name for them. But that bugbear, *argumentum à priori*, has frightened him out of his wits; and he can never see any thing of number or quality apply'd, tho' ever so necessary to determine the truth of facts, but he presently starts off, and cries out, *This is an argument à priori!* But, I hope, he does not serve tradesmen, shop-

keepers, and other people in common life at this rate, and fling back their accounts as arguments *à priori*, which he will have nothing to do with.

This learned author having thus set aside, as he imagined, what he calls my demonstration *à priori*, in which I had proved the truth of the thing in fact, without pretending to any proof *à priori* at all; he comes next to what he thinks fit to call my demonstration *à posteriori*; but this *priori* and *posteriori* runs so much in his head, that he seems quite giddy with it; and if he was to explain the difference between these two sorts of argumentation, I believe it would put him very much to his trumps. However, they are words he has got by heart; and we must see what farther application he makes of them.

The learned author just mentions and refers to six experimental facts of mine, which I had collected out of professor Boerhaave, and the best chemists that have ever wrote upon the natural principles of the solution and digestibility of bodies. He could not deny the facts; and every man, who has ever seen a course of chemistry, must be satisfy'd of the truth of them. But he has made it evident, that he cares no more for experimental facts, than for demonstrations *à priori*; and that neither of these can have any thing to do in his specifick magical scheme of physick.

But the facts and experiments which I had produced to prove, that the separation of parts, or the solubility and digestibility of

bodies,

bodies, must depend on the different degrees of heat and motion to which they are exposed, and which indeed I thought a good proof in fact, or *a posteriori* is here denied in all its natural and necessary consequences; and the author goes on to argue against this principle with solutions, and triumphs like a downright *Don Quixote*. From these experiments (concludes Dr. Morgan) we see how far the parts of vegetable, animal, and mineral substances may be comminuted by the natural concoctive heat of the stomach and blood, so as to render them capable of passing the lactals; and what previous management is necessary to render them thus digestible and soluble, when they are not so in their own nature; and also what method of exhibiting them in common food is best, where the stomach is weaken'd.

I must own, that I was so silly as to fancy this a good argument, and the sum and substance of what the chemists had offer'd concerning the digestibility and solubility of things in the stomach, whether they should be used either as food or physick. But let us see what this man of penetration has offer'd for my conviction and mortification, since I cannot help being vain enough to retain the same opinion still. But,

"It may seem strange to the reader, by what magick these inferences are found in those premises! An ordinary person, whose imagination runs no faster than his understanding, would be at some loss to find the connexion between the two: but such a reader is not Dr.

"Morgan: to comprehend the force of his reasonings, requires somewhat of a genius and fancy pregnant like his own: to reap the benefit of Dr. Morgan's discoveries, a man must have a faculty of supplying a number of intermediate matters by supposition; by the help only of a few hypotheses, Dr. Morgan's experiments become conclusive. These hypotheses are, that the human stomach, in digestion, acts only, first, as a mill, by grinding; and, secondly, as a boiling-pot of water, by coction. 'Tis necessary to find both the mill and the pot in the stomach; the one to comminute the food, the other to extract the oil of it; for Dr. Morgan has united two opposite doctrines of digestion, viz. trituration and coction. Many authors have contested the reality of either of them; and they, who assert the one, generally reject the other; but Dr. Morgan here, as in many other cases, has occasion for both sides of the question. The main stress, however, turns upon the stomach being a boiling-pot. There are certainly some resemblance between the two: both, for instance, are vessels; both have some degrees of warmth, and both have something in them: but they have their differences too; the one is cast-iron, the other flesh and blood; one is full of water, the other without any; one is furnish'd with a peculiar ferment or menstruum, which the other

“ other wants ; one is boiling hot,
 “ the other lukewarm. Tho’,
 “ if Dr. *Morgan* shall please to
 “ assert, that the *parieta’s* of the
 “ stomach are as hard and impe-
 “ netrable as iron itself ; that it
 “ has heat enough to boil the
 “ most solid meat to jelly in a
 “ few hours ; that the gastric
 “ liquor is neither of a fermenta-
 “ ble nor a menstruous nature,
 “ neither acid nor bilious, but
 “ mere harmless rain-water ; I
 “ should not be able to dispute
 “ any of these with him. p. 346.

Thus the author raves and rambles, to the astonishment of the illiterate, and the contempt of the learned. I have quoted this passage from him at large, as a general sample or copy of his countenance ; and to let the reader see what an uncommon faculty he has of laughing himself to scorn : for a few words will make it evident, that the author has here greatly exposed himself, without saying one word against me ; that he has all this while been in a *Midsummer* night’s dream, in which he has lost himself, and by some magick or other changed sides with me without knowing it.

I had argued, that substances, the parts of which cannot be separated, fluxiliz’d, and made fine enough by the closest strongest coction, by any known men-
 struum, or by any force of fire, even after they had been prepared for such a separation of their parts by trituration, grinding, &c. can much less be dissolved, digested, and rarify’d by the natural con-
 coctive heat and motion of the

stomach, so as to pass the lacteals, mix with the blood, and go on in the common circulation : and the reason here is obvious, because the digestion in the stomach, being only a close blood-warm infusion, assisted by the muscular action of the gastric coats and teguments, cannot possibly come up to these vastly greater powers and principles of separation and solution, which yet are found ineffec-
 tual in the present case. But here the author would turn the tables upon me, and make me compare the stomach to a mill, a boiling-pot, a chemical furnace, a calcining fire, &c. whereas every-body must see, that my argument concludes the quite contrary, and turns upon the reverse. But whatever may be said of the *stomach* as a *mill*, ’tis highly probable, that this gentleman could never have ground out so fine a piece of such hard indissoluble arguments, but by the help of a *wind-mill* in his own head. He would be thought to write in defence of the faculty ; but it cannot be supposed, without the utmost indignity, that they would ever equip out such a champion as this ; and perhaps very few of his common readers will be so dull, as to mistake such wildness for wit, and raving for reasoning.

But the author, having given this short specimen of his skill and abilities, and shewn what he could do if he thought fit, strikes out all the rest of the book with his *ipse dixits*. He thinks, just mentioning it sufficient to set aside any position or principle of mine ; but answering any reasons or arguments

guments is quite out of his province, and what he would scorn to attempt. He assures the reader, upon his word and honour, that there is nothing in the book worthy the least notice or regard; that 'tis made up of nothing but chimerical arbitrary suppositions of my own, about things that have really no existence; like the points, lines, and surfaces of *Euclid*, and other mathematicians, who pretend to found geometrical truth and scientific certainty upon mere non-entities, and creatures of their own imagination. But this is the way of mathematicians, to raise to themselves the reputation of learning, by advancing principles inconsistent with all truth, reason, or common sense; and while no quacks, empiricks, or physical pretenders in the world have ever been so much out of their wits as they. This, and such like stuff, is his rant. But the mathematicians ought, I think, to forgive him, for pity-sake; and not envy him so good a share of wit, while he pretends to nothing else. He has left himself accountable for

August 20, 1735.

nothing of his own, but a few blunders and misrepresentations, which were absolutely necessary to his purpose, and without which he could not have written ten lines, or completed any one single period. This I shall leave myself accountable for; and, if he can pick out any one column in the whole article, which he would stand to in reason and argument, he may chance to hear from me farther. But, in the mean while, I hope the author will be easy; as I can assure him I shall. He and I shall both gain our ends by what has pass'd between us: he has got the *laugh* on his side, and left me in the full possession of every thing that I had contended for as *true*. I do not think it can be any ground of uneasiness or dissatisfaction to this author, tho' it might indeed nettle anybody else, to give up truth for the sake of wit; and therefore I must leave it to his choice, either to push on the advantage he has gain'd, or sit down content with the present victory.

T. MORGAN.

ARTICLE XLVI.

A Discourse of FUNDAMENTALS: Being the Substance of two Charges delivered to the Middlesex Clergy, at the Easter Visitations of 1734 and 1735. By Daniel Waterland, D. D. Archdeacon of Middlesex, and Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty. Cambridge; printed for Cornelius Crownfield, Printer to the University of Cambridge; and John Crownfield, at the Rising-Sun in St. Paul's Church-yard, London. MDCCXXXV. In Octavo. Containing 63 Pages.

THOSE who receive or reject pieces which appear in print, according to their respec-

tive sizes, or the figure they make in the title-pages, will sometimes find the mistake of their

D d d

choice,

choice, on perusing *voluminous trifles and laborious nothings*. The little treatise before us, if they can be prevailed on to allow it a reading, will convince them that what is, by way of contempt, called a *Pamphlet*, may contain large and useful instructions on a subject of the utmost importance.

Of this nature is the doctrine of *fundamentals* in religion. The word frequently occurs in religious debates: "But, as our serious and learned author justly observes, the notion is often left obscure, and the application is so various among contending parties, that it may be difficult to fix any certain rules for it; tho' it is allow'd, on all hands, that much depends on it."

Dr. *Waterland* has not undertaken to discourse on this subject, without being well acquainted with what has been already said of it by many learned and judicious persons, most of whom complain of the perplexities appearing in it; but all mention it as of the greatest weight and importance: such are, Mr. *Mede*, Mr. *Ciblingworth*, *Joan. Hoornbeeck*, Dr. *Hammond*, Bishop *Stillfleet*, *Lambert Velthuyfius*, Dean *Sherlock*, Dr. *Clagget*, Baron *Spanheim*, *Puffendorf*, *Witsius*, *Alphonf. Turretin*, *Voetius*, and *Steph. Gauzen*; all either quoted, or refer'd to, at the bottom of the page.

Our author then tells us, what, in the common sense of mankind, is supposed to be meant by the term, when applied to religion in general, or to the christian religion in particular; viz. "Something essential to religion, or christia-

nity, so necessary to its being, or, at least, to its well-being, that it could not subsist, or maintain itself tolerably without it." After some short observations from scripture, and the practice of the primitive churches, for shewing the distinction between *fundamentals* and *non-fundamentals*, or *extra-fundamentals*, is not only *ancient*, but *well grounded*; our author farther remarks, that the importance of it appears from this, that the previous question to almost every dispute concerning *church-communion* depends on it.

As this distinction is undoubtedly just in the general, our learned author is of opinion, that there is certainly a way of clearing it from all reasonable exceptions. In order to this, he distinguishes between *fundamentals*, consider'd in an *abstract* view, as *essentials* of the christian fabrick or system; and *fundamentals* consider'd in a *relative* view to particular persons; in which latter respect they are frequently called *necessaries*, as being ordinarily necessary to salvation. "For, says the Doctor, tho' the *fundamentals* and the *necessaries* do really coincide, and are indeed the same thing (equal capacities and opportunities supposed) yet so great is the variety of capacities and opportunities in different persons, that one rule and measure of *necessaries* will not equally serve for all." This distinction being supported by reason, and the authority of some learned divines, it is observed, that all parties make the terms of *commu-*

tion somewhat more strict than the terms of salvation; and exclude many from *communion*, as erring *fundamentally*, whom they neither can nor dare condemn absolutely to eternal perdition.

Having thus cleared the way to the subject in hand, the Doctor defines a *fundamental* doctrine in the following words: "It is such a doctrine as is, in a strict sense, of the *essence* of christianity, without which the whole building and superstructure must fall; the belief of which is necessary to the very being of christianity, like the first principles of any art or science." Hence it is judiciously inferred, "That such doctrines as are found to be *intrinsical*, or essential to the christian covenant, are *fundamental truths*; and such as are plainly and directly *subversive* of it, are *fundamental errors*."

In the prosecution of this enquiry, the christian covenant is consider'd as including the seven following articles: *A founder and principal covenantor; a subject capable of being covenanted with; a charter of foundation; a Mediator; conditions to be perform'd; aids or means to enable to performance; and sanctions to bind the covenant and secure obedience.*

Under the first of these articles it is observed, that the covenant, here supposed, of grace and salvation, made with mankind by GOD the Father, in and by CHRIST JESUS, necessarily includes the existence of a Deity as a *fundamental* article of doctrine; and the belief of all such *perfections and attributes*, without which

GOD could not be said to be GOD. To this head belongs the belief of his being our *Creator, Preserver and Inspector* over our thoughts, words, and actions; and consequently, the denial of any one or more of these articles, is a *fundamental* error. "But beside the existence of some divine being thus consider'd in the general, it is farther *fundamental*, says the Doctor, in the *christian* system, to acknowledge a Deity in special; namely, *Jehovah*, GOD both of the Old and New Testament, and Father of CHRIST, in opposition to the false gods either of *heathens* or *hereticks*. Whence it is evident, that the disciples of *Simon Magus*, the *Cerinthians, Marcionites, Manichees, &c.* erred *fundamentally*."

Secondly, "A covenant between GOD and man supposes and implies, that man is capable of being covenanted with, has *freedom of will* sufficient to denominate him a *moral agent*, apt to discern between good and evil, and choose which he pleases. Therefore the doctrines of *free-will*, thus understood, and of the *essential* differences between *moral good* and *evil*, are *fundamental* verities; to disown them, or either of them, is to err *fundamentally*."

As the *charter of foundation* is undoubtedly an *essential* of the covenant, it is, in the third place, inferred, "That therefore, of course, the admittance of the *sacred oracles*, which are the

“ charter itself, or at least the
 “ only *authentick* instrument of
 “ conveyance, is *essential* to the
 “ covenant; consequently, to re-
 “ ject or disbelieve the *divine au-*
 “ *thority* of holy writ, is to err
 “ *fundamentally*.

Under the fourth article it is observed, that the belief of JESUS being the *Messiah* and Mediator of the *christian* covenant, is manifestly *fundamental*, according to the whole tenor of both the Old and New Testament; and that the acknowledging such a Mediator as is clearly described in the scriptures, a *divine* Mediator, a Mediator who is very GOD and very man, tho' one CHRIST, is likewise *fundamental* in the christian system: consequently, to deny the real and proper *divinity* of JESUS CHRIST, is to err *fundamentally*. “ To this head, continues our author, belong the “ doctrines of *expiation, atonement,* “ or *satisfaction*, made by CHRIST “ in his blood; a *fundamental* “ article of christianity fully ex- “ press'd, frequently and earnest- “ ly inculcated quite through the “ New Testament.

Fifthly, The *conditions* required of us by the covenant are evidently *essential* to the covenant itself; and therefore the doctrines of *repentance* and a *holy life* are *fundamental*.

Sixthly, “ The *aids* or *enabling* “ *means*, without which the co- “ venanter cannot perform the “ conditions, must of course be “ be looked on as *essential* to the “ covenant. The two sacra- “ ments, in this view, consider'd “ as *enabling means of grace*, are

“ *essential* to the covenant.” Among the necessary *aids*, our author reckons the assistance or guidance of GOD's *holy spirit*, as the chief of all, and what contains all others. “ And because “ this cannot be rightly under- “ stood without admitting, that “ the Holy Spirit is *omni-present,* “ *all-sufficient*, and, in a word, “ *strictly divine*, therefore the “ *divinity* of the *Holy Ghost* is a “ *fundamental* article of the *chris-* “ *tian* covenant.” To this it is added, “ That since it is mani- “ fested, from the whole tenor of “ scripture, that there is but one “ GOD, it is evident, that the “ doctrine of *three* real persons in “ *one* eternal Godhead is a *fun-* “ *damental* doctrine of *christia-* “ *nity*.” The importance of this doctrine has been shewn at large in an excellent and elaborate treatise publish'd last year by the same learned author.

The *functions* proper to bind the covenant, and give it due force and efficacy, are consider'd, in the seventh place, as *essential* to the said covenant. Such are, the doctrines of a *future state*, a *resurrection*, final judgment by CHRIST our Lord, eternal *rewards* and *punishments*; which are therefore *fundamental* points of christian theology.

Dr. Waterland doth not think it necessary to exhibit any complete catalogue either of *fundamental* truths or errors; it is sufficient, that we have a *certain* rule for our direction, whenever a question arises about church-communion, heresy, schism, or the like. It is acknowledg'd, that there may

may be some difficulty in marking out the exact partitions which divide *fundamentals* from *non-fundamentals*, as they differ only in the degree of *more* or *less* weighty. But then it is observed, that the like difficulty will be found in settling the precise boundaries between *lawful* and *unlawful*, *right* and *wrong*, *virtue* and *vice*, in particular instances; which, however, is no just objection against the undertaking. It is farther remark'd, "That whatever perplexities may sometimes arise in *theory*, there will be few or none in *practice*; since in case of a just and reasonable *doubt*, whether such or such an article be *fundamental*, or otherwise, the known rule is to choose the *safer* side." When the Doctor speaks of *doubtful cases*, he would not be understood of *doubtful doctrines*, for such are not *fundamental*; but of such cases where the *truth* of the doctrine is, at least, *morally* certain, and the *importance* of it only *doubtful*. In such cases, he conceives, the *safer* way is to preserve *peace* and *charity*, and not break communion on account of a truth which cannot be clearly proved *fundamental*.

This rule being thus laid down and explained, our author proceeds to illustrate and confirm it, by comparing it with other *rules*; some of which differ from it only in *words*; others in the *main thing*, and some very widely. Those of the latter sort are ten in number; which are here produced, and distinctly consider'd. *First* then, some have referred us to the *definition of the church*, as the surest

or the only rule for determining *fundamentals*. To this it is replied, "That the *definition of the church*, even in the *primitive* times, is merely *declaratory*, not *effective*; makes no *fundamental* articles, but only declares what was supposed to be so previously to that declaration.

But, *secondly*, some take *scripture truths* and *fundamental truths* to be the same; imagining, that every thing asserted in *holy writ* is *fundamental*. The Doctor observes, that this opinion confounds the *truth* or *usefulness* of what is there deliver'd, with the *importance* or *necessity* of it; and allows no difference between *weightier* matters, and matters *less weighty*; which it may be sufficient to believe in the gross, under this one proposition; *Whatever the scripture declares or teaches, is infallibly true and right*. To this he adds, that the rule under consideration appears faulty in *defect*, as well as *excess*; "For, says he, as every *scripture-tenet* is not *fundamental*; so neither doth *scripture*, strictly speaking, contain all *fundamental* truths. The *certainty* of the *Canon*, and the *authenticity* of the sacred *Code*, are *fundamental* articles, and are previous to those which *scripture* itself contains; and our obligation to receive them resolves into this *fundamental* principle of *natural* religion, That we are bound to receive with reverence whatever God shall sufficiently make known to us, as his law, word, and will,

"A third

" A third pretended rule for determining *fundamentals*, is to admit every thing *expresly* taught in scripture, and nothing but what is so; which differs from the former, as there is a difference between saying *every thing taught*, and every thing *expresly taught*." The Doctor is of opinion, that this rule also is faulty both in *excess* and *defect*: in the former extreme, as it makes more *fundamentals* than there really are; in the latter, as it doth not take in all that is truly *fundamental*. " The sense of scripture, says he, is scripture; and such sense may be *certain* and *indubitable*, when it is not *expres*; and if the point of doctrine contained in it be of the *important* kind, nearly affecting the *vitals* of christianity, it is a *fundamental* article.

The fourth rule, here examined, is that " Whatever scripture has declared *expresly necessary*, or commanded us to believe, under pain of *damnation*, or of *exclusion* from christian communion, that is *fundamental*, and nothing else." As to the first part, it is acknowledged, that whatever is thus strongly bound on us, is *fundamental*. But then the Doctor denies, that whatever the scripture has not so bound on us is not *fundamental*: so that this rule is faulty in *defect*. A plain revelation of any doctrine, according to him, carries in it the force of a strict command of assenting to it as true, whenever we think of it as revealed; and if it be found to bear an *intrinsical* or *essential* connexion with the *chris-*

tian covenant, it becomes a *fundamental* article.

Fifthly, It is observed, " That some very considerable protestant writers, in their disputes with the *Romanists*, have referred to the *Creed* called the *Apostles*, both for the rule and sample of *fundamentals*." The authors here meant are *Penit*, *Usher*, *Davenant*, *Calixtus*, *Chillingworth*, *Stillingfleet*, *Tillotson*, *Whitby*, &c. But Dr. *Waterland* takes notice, that the most intended by them was, that the said *Creed* contains all necessary matters of *simple belief*; " Which, if admitted, doth not, says he, sufficiently answer our present purpose, with respect to the question of *church-communion*; for *fundamentals* of worship, and of *christian morality*, must be consider'd in this case, as well as *fundamentals* of mere *faith*." To which, among other things, it is added, " That the *Apostles Creed* rather *supposes*, than *contains* the article of the *divine* authority and inspiration of scripture; and therefore is no complete catalogue or summary of *fundamentals*."

Sixthly, " Some have been of opinion, that the sixth chapter of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, in the two first verses, gives us a complete list of *fundamentals*, under four or five articles, viz. *repentance*, *faith in God*, *baptism*, with *confirmation*, *resurrection*, and *judgment*." For this, a passage is quoted, at the bottom of the page, from Dr. *Clarke's* posthumous sermons. Our author

author thinks this opinion founded only on the *equivocal* sense of the word *fundamental*; and the want of distinguishing between the *elementaries* and the *essentials* of christianity. He animadverts on the aforementioned passage from the late Dr. Clarke, and then concludes with observing, that if the text, here referred to, be understood in the *inclusive* way, and with all it may be supposed to comprehend, it may be said to include all the *fundamentals*, and even more: but if it is taken in the *exclusive* way, it is certain, that it falls very short of a complete catalogue.

As converts were, in the apostolical times, admitted to baptism on the confession of one single article, *viz.* that JESUS is the *Messiah*, with two or three concomitant articles; some have concluded (and Mr. Locke among the rest) that such a confession gives a man a right to *christian communion*; and that nothing more is to be absolutely insisted on as *fundamental*. This is the *seventh* rule here produced and censured. The absurdity of this way of reasoning is shewn in several respects; we shall mention but one. "To deny JESUS to be the *Messiah*, is, in effect, to renounce christianity . . . and therefore, insisting on that confession only, as a term of *communion*, is as much as to say, that all but downright apostates are to be received as *christian brethren*, so far as *faith* is concerned.

"An *eighth* pretended rule for determining *fundamentals*, is *universality* among christians, so

"call'd; to throw out what is *disputed*, and retain only what *all agree in.*" This, as our author justly observes, is a rule as *uncertain* in its application and use, as it is false in its main ground. "For, says he, how shall any one know what all sects agree in, or how long they will do so? Or, if that could be known, are we to be guided by the floating humours, fancies and follies of men, or by the unerring wisdom of GOD?" As baron *Spanheim* has consider'd this popular pretence at large, our author is the shorter on this article, and passes on to a *ninth* rule, which is the *universal agreement* of the whole race of mankind, or of the soberer part at least, in all ages. Thus the number of *fundamentals*, and *terms of communion*, are reduced to five articles of *natural religion*, *viz.* the *existence* of a *Deity*; some kind of *worship* to be paid him; the practice of *moral virtue*; *repentance* for sins past; and belief of a future state of *rewards* and *punishments*. This wild opinion was maintained by our countryman lord *Herbert*, in several of his treatises; and has been fully confuted by *Spanheim*, to whom we are refer'd.

The *tenth* and last pretence, here consider'd, is that of dismissing all concern for a *right faith*, as insignificant, and comprehending all *fundamentals* in the single article of what is called a *good life*; to which, says our author, some are pleased to add *faith* in the *divine promises*. Here it is observed, that the phrase of a *good life*,

life, is very equivocal and ambiguous; and that almost every different sect has its own peculiar idea of it: that the terms ought to imply a sincere love of truth, accompanied with an humble submission of one's own conceits to the plain and salutary doctrine of the gospel, or divine revelation; which, in other words, is called an *obedience of faith*. "It is a vain thing, says the Doctor, to speak of a *good life*, as sepeate from *saving* belief or knowledge, where such knowledge may be

had. The pretence to it carries a two-fold absurdity along with it: it supposes the end already attained, without the previous *necessary* means; and makes the *whole* to subsist without the essential parts."

Having thus examined the several *improper* or *erroneous* rules suggested for determining *fundamentals*, Mr. Archdeacon concludes with a pathetick exhortation to the clergy present at the delivery of these charges.

N. B. In the *Literary Magazine* for July, the Reader is desired to correct the following ERRORS of the Press.

PAGE 335. Col. 1. Lin. 11. for *in a dispute*, read *in dispute*; l. 15. for *that Faculty*, read *the Faculty*; *ibid.* col. 2. l. 28. for *antagonist*, read *antagonists*. p. 336. col. 2. l. 3. for *turns*, read *turn*; l. 35. for *hycchondriacal*, read *hypocondriacal*. p. 337. col. 1. l. 30. for *deliquium*, read *deliquium*; l. 31. for *relaſtante*, read *reluctante*; l. 32. for *undequaque*, read *undiquaque*. p. 338. col. 1. l. 31. for *light cleaſing*, read *tight cleaſing*. p. 340. col. 1. l. 15. for *that book*, read *the book*; l. 36. for *Aretin*, read *Aretino*; l. 37. for *Iadio*, read *Iddio*; l. 38. for *Perch*, read *Perche*; for *nol' lonobbe*, read *no'l Conobbe*; *ibid.* col. 2. l. 5. for *fauls*, read *fautes*; l. 21. for *this preſent*, read *his preſent*. p. 342. col. 2. l. 17. for *beard to find*, read *hard to find*. p. 343. col. 1. l. 25. for *Joachin*, read *Jachin*; *ibid.* col. 2. l. 20. for *intermiſſion*, read *intromiſſion*. p. 344. col. 2. l. 16. for *not leſs than viſible ones*, read *are leſs than any viſible ones*; l. 35. for *Aſcellu.*, read *Aſellius*. p. 345. col. 1. l. 39. for *of the ſize we*, read *of this we*. p. 346. col. 1. l. 43. for *viſcous*, read *viſcus*; *ibid.* col. 2. l. 8. for *communicated*, read *communitated*. p. 347. col. 1. l. 14. for *reſemblance*, read *reſemblances*; l. 16. for *degrees*, read *degree*; l. 27. for *parieta's*, read *parietes*; *ibid.* col. 2. l. 37. for *ſpecifick terms*, read *ſpecifick forms*. p. 348. col. 2. l. 23. for *qualies*, read *qualities*. p. 349. col. 2. l. 21. for *animalcula's*, read *animalcular*. p. 350. col. 1. l. 1. for *Valliſnieri's*, read *Valliſnieri's*; l. 38. for *animalcula's*, read *animalcular*; *ibid.* col. 2. l. 9. for *be a grain*, read *be to a grain*. p. 351. col. 1. l. 28. for *trillions*, read *trillions*; *ibid.* col. 1. l. 1. for *concreſſible*, read *concreſcible*; l. 35. for *fluidian*, read *Fluddian*. p. 352. col. 2. l. 26. for *which are*, read *we have*; l. 46. for *adapt*, read *adapte*. p. 353. col. 1. l. 14. for *and it is*, read *as it is*.